

Issues and Conclusions

Compliance with Site Master Plan

- 3.1 As the AWM is situated within a Designated Area under the provisions of the National Capital Plan, approval for the proposed East Building works must be sought from the body administering the Plan, the National Capital Authority (NCA).¹
- 3.2 In written evidence, the NCA reported that consultation had taken place between the NCA, the AWM and the former AHC, and noted that the AWM's Statement of Evidence to the Public Works Committee addressed a number of the issues raised during consultation.²
- 3.3 According to the NCA, there were still a number of outstanding concerns; namely:
- provision of an example of the proposed roofing material;
 - provision of an example of the pigmented pre-cast linear external wall planks which are to match the colour of Anzac Hall;
 - details of the location of the mechanical plant and the need for exhaust vents;
 - details of the continuous mesh cover around the perimeter; and
 - details of future bus and car parking requirements.³
- 3.4 At the public hearing, the Committee questioned the AWM and NCA on how they intended to resolve these matters in order to ensure compliance with the Site Master Plan.

1 *Volume of Submissions*, Submission No. 3, paragraph 3

2 *ib id*, paragraph 5

3 *ib id*

Roofing Material

- 3.5 The AHC stated its preference for the proposed East Building to have a copper roof, or if that were not feasible, another roof fabric in keeping with the quality of the building.⁴
- 3.6 At the hearing, the AWM told the Committee that it did not see the need for a copper roof similar to that on the main building:
- “We do not want to mimic and detract from the very strong architectural lines of that main building.”⁵
- 3.7 The NCA said that the Authority would consider allowing an alternative roof fabric, provided that discussions take place between the NCA, the Department of Environment and Heritage and the AWM to determine
- “the best compromise or the optimum outcome that you can achieve”.⁶

External Wall Planks

- 3.8 The AWM stated that, for reasons of cost, the AWM was proposing to use a precast pigmented concrete rather than stone for the exterior cladding of the East Building.⁷
- 3.9 At the hearing, the NCA reiterated its desire that the AWM utilise high quality materials for this project; for the roof, building fabric and all materials and finishes.⁸
- 3.10 The AWM provided the Committee with details of the proposed building fabric’s colour and texture and expressed confidence that the exterior of the new building will have a “very fine-honed finish.”⁹
- 3.11 The Committee supports the NCA’s wish to see high quality materials used for both the roofing and building fabrics of the proposed development. Situated on Walter Burley Griffin’s ‘land axis,’ the War Memorial is integral to the National Capital’s vista. The AWM is not only one of Canberra’s most prominent buildings; it is also an important national institution which caters to an increasing number of visitors.

4 *Volume of Submissions*, Submission No. 3, Attachment A

5 Appendix D, Official Transcript of Evidence, page 3

6 *ib id*, page 17

7 *ib id*, page 9

8 *ib id*, page 16

9 *ib id*, page 9

Recommendation 1

The Committee recommends that the Australian War Memorial continue to liaise with the National Capital Authority in respect of the roofing and building fabrics utilised in the construction of the new East Building, to ensure that suitable high quality materials are used in keeping with the standards of the Australian War Memorial precinct.

Location of the Mechanical Plant and Exhaust Vents

3.12 In written evidence, the NCA noted that it would not permit a visible roof plant and all services and mechanical plant components should be integrated into the building form.¹⁰

3.13 At the hearing, the AWM sought to assure the Committee that it had consulted the Authority on this issue and the proposed building's vent protrusions would not affect the visual vista:

“Our approach, which we have discussed with [the NCA], is to group these protrusions together as much as possible and to treat them in the same type of finish as the roof. For all intents and purposes, if you were on Mount Ainslie, you would probably not see them at all.”¹¹

3.14 The AWM added that,

“The NCA seem very comfortable with that.”¹²

Mesh Cover

3.15 The Committee asked the AWM to elaborate on its intention to install a continuous mesh cover around the perimeter of the proposed building.¹³

3.16 The AWM explained that creating a trench around the building was an inexpensive way to reinforce and waterproof the lower parts of the building:

“The top of that trench then has a grid mesh surface so that people cannot fall down it but it still allows ventilation down through there.”¹⁴

10 *Volume of Submissions*, Submission No. 3, Attachment B

11 Appendix D, Official Transcript of Evidence, page 10

12 *ib id*

13 *ib id*, page 8

14 *ib id*, page 9

- 3.17 The Committee asked the NCA to outline any concerns it had in regard to this arrangement. The NCA replied that it did not necessarily have a problem with the mesh cover; it simply wished to learn how it would work. Further, the NCA was satisfied with the AWM's description at the hearing of what the mesh cover entailed.¹⁵

Car-Parking

- 3.18 While the AWM does not intend to provide additional car-parking as part of the works¹⁶, the NCA is concerned that the Memorial address future car-parking requirements, particularly with respect to the removal of the temporary car park accessed off Fairburn Avenue.¹⁷
- 3.19 At the hearing, the Committee asked the AWM to comment on its present and prospective car-parking arrangements and the repercussions of future growth in staff or visitor numbers.¹⁸
- 3.20 The AWM told the Committee that while there was sufficient parking for the foreseeable future, the Memorial was very mindful of the issue:

“We want to provide good amenity for our visitors. I did mention that in our long-range master plan we would see underground parking somewhere. That is something we will address in due course. We believe that once the building is finished, we can dispense with the temporary car park, as we will not have the extra demand by workers on site...we think that will be adequate, but it is an issue we keep under close control.”¹⁹

Building Height and Character

- 3.21 The NCA prefers that the height of the new building be kept at or below RL 599.970.²⁰ The Authority also suggested that the building be assigned its own street address and the tunnel link be fitted with either a skylight or window to allow for some natural light.²¹
- 3.22 At the hearing, the AWM addressed these matters in turn. On the issue of the building's height, the Memorial said that it had endeavoured to meet the NCA's requirement by lowering the height proposed by its architect

15 Appendix D, Official Transcript of Evidence, page 17

16 Appendix C, Submission No. 1, paragraph 32

17 *Volume of Submissions*, Submission No. 3, paragraph 5

18 Appendix D, Official Transcript of Evidence, page 5

19 *ib id*, page 10

20 *Volume of Submissions*, Submission No. 3, Attachment B

21 *ib id*

Denton Corker Marshall (DCM). This had incurred a financial penalty of \$300, 000, the cost of which had been absorbed in the current budget.²²

- 3.23 In relation to whether the building should have a street address, the AWM told the Committee that its architects had advised against having a street address as,

“...it is for staff only. The staff and collection come in through the rear. Staff access the building via a tunnel within the working environment. We do not see the need for an address per se.”²³

- 3.24 Finally, with respect to the minimisation of windows in the proposed design, the AWM said it believed the building would have adequate window coverage:

“Where the floor areas are occupied there are sufficient windows to provide natural daylight for the occupants.”²⁴

Consultation

National Capital Authority

- 3.25 At the hearing, both the NCA and AWM expressed their belief that any outstanding matters in relation to compliance with the Site Master Plan would be resolved through discussions and negotiation.²⁵ In its closing statement the Memorial stated that within weeks, the NCA could be provided with the level of detailed design information it required.²⁶
- 3.26 The Acting Chair noted for the record that there will be further consultation between the AWM and NCA on these matters.²⁷

Staff

- 3.27 The Committee asked the AWM to comment on its staff consultation process.²⁸ The Memorial said that it had carried out extensive consultation, especially with those people directly affected by the move into the new building. Staff input had been sought on the fit-out design,

22 Appendix D, Official Transcript of Evidence, page 3

23 ib id

24 ib id, page 11

25 Appendix D, Official Transcript of Evidence, pages 15 and 17

26 ib id, page 18

27 ib id

28 ib id, page 4

the logistics of moving collections through the tunnel and achieving improved functionality in the workshop and research areas.²⁹

Australian Greenhouse Office

3.28 The AWM's statement of evidence to the Committee listed a number of organisations which were consulted in the development of the East Building proposal. This list did not include reference to the Australian Greenhouse Office (AGO).³⁰ At the public hearing, the Committee asked the AWM whether it planned to consult with the AGO in relation to energy conservation, environmental sustainability issues and compliance with the *Commonwealth Energy Policy*. In its response, the AWM undertook to seek advice from the AGO.³¹ The Memorial pointed out that it was considering energy conservation measures such as double glazing for the new building.³²

Ecological Sustainability

3.29 A submission from Environment ACT outlined that agency's requirements in respect of water resources, including:

- ensuring that no contaminated water leaves the site during the development or operation of the facility;
- implementation measures to ensure that, as far as practicable, stormwater run-off does not exceed pre-development levels; and
- incorporating measures to minimise the demand on potable water supplies.³³

3.30 Environment ACT held that these objectives will have been met if, "...excess run-off from the 1 in 3 month storm event will be retained on-site."³⁴

3.31 The AWM was questioned by the Committee on whether it will meet the requirements of the *ACT Water Resources Strategy* as outlined by Environment ACT.³⁵

29 Appendix D, Official Transcript of Evidence, page 4

30 Appendix C, Submission No. 1, paragraph 161

31 Appendix D, Official Transcript of Evidence, page 13

32 ib id, page 11

33 *Volume of Submissions*, Submission No. 2

34 ib id

35 Appendix D, Official Transcript of Evidence, page 7

- 3.32 The AWM informed the Committee that it will install containment tanks to prevent excess stormwater run-off.³⁶ On the matter of pre-treatment facilities for waste from the photographic area, the AWM stated that it will put in place filtration systems to ensure that contaminated water does not enter the public water supply.³⁷

Design Features

Access and Egress

- 3.33 As the East Building will be designed for collection activity and not for public use, there will be no public entrance. It is envisaged that staff will move between the East Building and the Memorial via an underground tunnel.³⁸ In addition, a discreet staff entrance, separate delivery and equipment access will be provided to the east, which will not be apparent to the general public.³⁹
- 3.34 At the hearing, the Committee wanted to know whether there were any occupational health and safety, or fire safety, issues associated with the lack of a front entrance.⁴⁰
- 3.35 The AWM said that the building will have the requisite number of exits and escape stairs and assured the Committee that:
- “...there is no issue of safety as far as staff is concerned”.⁴¹

Tunnel

- 3.36 The Committee asked the AWM to comment on why it had chosen to link the East Building to the main Memorial Building via an underground tunnel.⁴²
- 3.37 The AWM replied that the tunnel provided a protected and safe means of transport for moving collection items between the two buildings.⁴³

36 Appendix D, Official Transcript of Evidence, pages 7 - 8

37 ib id, page 8

38 Appendix C, Submission No. 1, paragraphs 17 - 18

39 ib id, paragraph 55

40 Appendix D, Official Transcript of Evidence, page 3

41 ib id

42 Appendix D, Official Transcript of Evidence, page 4

43 ib id

Provision for People with Disabilities

- 3.38 In written evidence, the AWM stated that the proposed work will comply with all relevant codes in respect of provision for people with disabilities.⁴⁴ The Committee asked the AWM to comment specifically on access arrangements for disabled persons.⁴⁵
- 3.39 The AWM explained that the proposed building will contain appropriate provisions for entry and egress:
- “External access from the rear - from the outside on the east side of the building – is complete at-grade access for disabled people.”⁴⁶
- 3.40 The new building will also feature a large lift suitable for use by all persons.⁴⁷

Project Delivery

- 3.41 The AWM intends that the proposed work will be delivered via a Document and Design Construct contract.⁴⁸ At the hearing, the AWM explained why this was the preferred means of project delivery:
- “...unlike with design construct it means that we- with our client and the architects- can work the design through to a point where it is fully resolved prior to letting the contract.”⁴⁹
- 3.42 Furthermore, this method of project delivery proved successful in the War Memorial’s last major undertaking, the Anzac Hall project.⁵⁰

Local Employment

- 3.43 The AWM anticipates that the proposed work will
- “provide a boost to employment in the construction industries in Canberra and result in an on-site workforce peaking at approximately 80 persons during the 12 month construction period.”⁵¹

44 Appendix C, Submission No. 1, paragraph 153

45 Appendix D, Official Transcript of Evidence, page 6

46 Appendix D, Official Transcript of Evidence, page 6

47 *ibid*

48 Appendix C, Submission No. 1, paragraph 163

49 Appendix D, Official Transcript of Evidence, page 11

50 *ib id*

51 Appendix C, Submission No. 1, paragraph 168

- 3.44 At the hearing, the Committee asked the AWM to comment on the capacity of the local construction industry to undertake the project.⁵²
- 3.45 The AWM advised the Committee that presently the industry in Canberra was very busy. However, the Memorial was encouraged by the fact that a number of local contractors had already informally expressed an interest in the project.⁵³
- 3.46 The Committee wished to know whether this factor might impact on costs. The AWM said that it may, but the Memorial had had held discussions with its quantity surveyor on the matter and believes
- “...the costs reflect the current market position.”⁵⁴

Recommendation 2

The Committee recommends that the proposed new East Building for the Australian War Memorial, Canberra, ACT, proceed at the estimated cost of \$11.6 million.

Hon Judi Moylan MP
Chair
8 December 2004

52 Appendix D, Official Transcript of Evidence, page 12

53 ib id

54 ib id